

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed June 4, 2007, wherein the Claims were rejected as failing to define the invention, and as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,727,814 to White ("White"). In response, Applicant has amended Claims 1-5. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by any of these amendments.

In addition, new Claims 6-14 are presented herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by any of these amendments. **Claims 1-14 are thus pending in the application.**

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, all remaining claims in this application are patentably distinct over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in the application are respectfully solicited.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 6-8 are directed to a child restraint that removably connects to seat belts and shoulder harnesses of a vehicle.

Support for Claims 6-8 are as follows. New Claim 6 is supported, for example, in the upper portion of Fig. 4 and in paragraphs [0023] and [0025]. New Claim 7 is supported, for example, in paragraph [0023]. New Claim 8 is supported, for example, in Figures 1 and 4, and in paragraph [0023], and in the original Claim 5.

New Claims 9-14 are directed to a child restraint that attaches to a seat belt and a shoulder harness.

Support for New Claims 9-14 is found, for example, in Figures 1 and 4, and in paragraph [0023], and in the original Claim 5.

No new matter is introduced by the new claims, support for which is provided below. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not teach or suggest the invention of claims 6-14, and that the claims are allowable over the prior art. Specifically, the prior art does not teach or suggest a child restraining removably attachable to a vehicle, or a child restraint that is attachable to the seat belt and shoulder harness of a vehicle seat.

REJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to define the invention. In response, Claims 1-5 have been amended, and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 have been amended to provide structure to the claims by reciting how the components are interconnected to provide an operable device. The amendments are supported by the original claims and the specification, particularly Figures 1 and 4, and paragraphs [0021] – [0026] of the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Applicant believes that the amendments to Claim 1-5 address each of the points raised by the Examiner. In particular, the claims, as amended, are believed to define the invention and organized to illustrate the structure of a complete operative device. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5 were rejected as being anticipated by White. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection under §112, as described above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-5, as amended, are not anticipated by White, and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

White teaches a child restraint that is configured to restrain a child lying on a seat. The child restraint is permanently fixed to the car (see column 2, lines 55-65) and includes two latch plates (plates (7) and (8)) for inserting into two built-in seat belt buckles. The restraint also includes two matching sets of latches and buckles (5 and 4, and 15 and 14) for fastening the child restraint to itself and about a child.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a child restraining that is removably attachable to a vehicle, specifically to seat belt straps and a shoulder harness. This is in contrast to White, which teaches a child restraint that is affixed to the vehicle and that is configured to attach only to lap belts.

There is no teaching or suggestion in White for a child restraint that is removable

from the vehicle, and there is also no teaching or suggestion in White for a child restraint configured to attach to a shoulder harness. Applicant therefore believes that Claim 1, as amended, and Claims 2-5, as amended and which depend on Claim 1, are not anticipated by White. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under §102 of Claims 1-5, as amended, be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner should feel that a telephone interview would be productive in resolving any issues in the case, please telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

December 3, 2007

1563 Solano Ave., #206
Berkeley, CA 94705
Tel: (510) 841-4711; Fax: (510) 217-6844

/Steven R. Vosen/
Steven R. Vosen
Registration No. 45,186